

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/487,728

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Applicant submits herewith one sheet of annotated drawings (Figure 1).

Attachment: 1 Annotated Sheet

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 have been examined. Claims 1-9 and 11-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**I. Preliminary Matters**

As a preliminary matter, the drawings and claim 10 are objected to for the reasons set forth on pages 2-4 of the present Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Figure 1, as shown in the enclosed annotated drawing. In view of the drawing amendment, Applicant has made a minor amendment to the specification to refer to the added reference numeral. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate whether the proposed drawing amendment is acceptable. Further, Applicant has amended claim 10 in a manner believe to overcome the objection.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Mori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,267).

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 1 recites that the menu includes upper directories that are generated for individual entries in the print setup, and lower directories that are generated for individual setup values, one of which is included in each of the entries. Further, the menu is formed by correlating visual display elements corresponding to the document file with said lower directories.

The Examiner maintains that Mori discloses the above features. In particular, the Examiner maintains that menus 41, 44 disclose the claimed individual entries in the print setup, while menu 45 discloses the claimed individual setup values (See Figure 23 of Mori and page 5 of Office Action). However, the menu 41 does not disclose the claimed features, and menu 44 discloses types of individual setup values, rather than the claimed individual entries in the print setup. Further, menu 45 of Mori does not disclose the claimed individual setup values, rather, menu 45 discloses types of individual entries in the print setup.

In view of the above, the menu 44 (i.e., individual setup values) is allocated to an upper directory, and menu 45 (i.e., individual entries in the print setup) is allocated to a lower directory, which is contrary or opposite to the recitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

With respect to independent claims 4, 5, 8, and 12-18, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Since claims 2, 6 and 9 are dependent upon one of claims 1, 5 or 8, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Further, Applicant has canceled claims 3, 7 and 11, without prejudice or disclaimer, and incorporated the features into their respective independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3, 7 and 11 is now moot.

### **III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mori as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Martin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,015). However, since claim 10 is dependent upon claim 8, and Martin fails to cure the deficient teachings of Mori, in regard to claim 8, Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

In addition, Applicant submits that neither Mori nor Martin, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least, “said printer transmits said print data stored in said storage means directly to said different printer,” as recited in claim 10. The Examiner believes that Martin makes up for the deficiencies of Mori, and believes that Martin satisfies the features set forth in claim 10. Martin teaches that when a print job is transferred from one particular printer to another printer on the network, the print job is first transferred from the printer to the host computer (see column 14, lines 57-67), and then the print job, i.e., the particular file, is transmitted or written to each printer on the network that has been designated as a “destination” printer (see column 16, lines 35-41). Nowhere, however, does Martin disclose that print data is transmitted directly to a different printer. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over Mori and Martin, either alone or in combination.

#### IV. Newly Added Claims

Applicant has added new claims 19 and 20 to provide a varying scope of coverage. *See the non-limiting embodiment in Fig. 3, for example, showing upper directories that correspond to printers.* Applicant submits that these new claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

#### V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

Date: October 3, 2005 (Since October 2, 2005 falls on a Sunday)